



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*Das Athener Nationalmuseum.* Phototypische Wiedergabe seiner Schätze mit erläuterndem Text von J. N. SVORONOS. Deutsche Ausgabe besorgt von DR. W. BARTH. Hefte I—VI. Pp. 182. Sixty plates. Athens: Beck & Barth, 1903—. M. 16 each Heft.

Evidently this useful work is not progressing as rapidly as the promoters anticipated, for instead of about sixty plates with accompanying text each year, as was first promised, only sixty plates in all have appeared up to March of the current year. The scheme of the entire publication includes marble sculptures, bronzes, vases, gems, and other small objects; in short all treasures of the museum except the prehistoric finds and the inscriptions. Plates and text are in quarto form. The reproductions vary in size with the importance of the object, one plate in some cases containing six or more pieces of sculpture. An inexpensive process has been chosen with intent to keep the price of the work low; certainly the slight artistic value of many of the objects published would not warrant costly plates. The illustrations are, nevertheless, good enough to give clearly the composition of relief sculpture, and even to be of some value for stylistic comparisons. A general subject division and, within the subject, chronological division of the material is maintained with the following exception: a few special collections which have not been divided in the Museum are treated as a whole in the publication. Thus Parts I and II are concerned with the marbles and the large and small bronzes found in the sea near the island of Anticythera. Parts III—VI give many of the relief sculptures, exclusive of grave reliefs, and this series of reliefs is to be completed in later numbers. In the text are full statistics in regard to each object, find-spot, dimensions, material, a detailed description, and exhaustive bibliography—this last one of the most serviceable features of the publication. It seems a little unfortunate that the comments on the subjects do not follow the exact order of the plates. In turning from the illustrations the reader has occasionally to look through several pages to find the description of a given work. It is also to be regretted that the author indulges in such lengthy discussions of the individual pieces of sculpture. Despite the learning displayed, the interpretations proposed of the Eleusinian Relief, of the Echelos and Basile relief, as of many other sculptures, are not convincing. In regard to the relief in which Echelos and Basile appear, the views of Professor Kekule von Stradonitz in the Berlin Winckelmannsprogramm for 1905, based it is true partly on new evidence, are much more simple and probable. These interpretative passages, which have assumed the length of independent essays, increase the bulk of the text; the result is that the text is far behind the plates, many works having already appeared in the illustrations about which



the author's comments are not yet forthcoming. The rapid consummation of this large undertaking is greatly to be desired, for an extended pictorial record of the Greek National Museum would be an invaluable addition to the archaeologist's working library.

CAROLINE L. RANSOM

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

---

*Case Constructions with Similis and its Compounds.* By THOMAS MADISON JONES. Johns Hopkins dissertation. Baltimore: Privately printed, 1903. Pp. 45.

This paper is a very careful and competent discussion of the subject indicated by its title. Professor Jones subjects to searching criticism the leading theories propounded by grammarians ancient and modern concerning the principles governing the employment of cases with *similis* and its compounds, beginning with that of Flavius Caper of the second century, who laid down the proposition: *illius similis ad mores refertur; illi similis ad vultum*—a theory which, though now banished from most of our Latin grammars, is still unfortunately current in much esoteric teaching. Professor Jones convincingly demonstrates the incorrectness of this theory, as well as the inadequacy of others that have succeeded, treating with special thoroughness and ability the highly subjective theory of Haase. The author's own conclusions are that the difference in case usage with *similis* and its compounds marks not a logical distinction, but one partly of time, partly of style. He holds that the genitive was originally characteristic rather of the conversational style. This theory is consistent with the usage of Plautus, with the general absence of the genitive in the higher forms of poetry, and with the prevalence of the genitive in Cicero's *Letters*. But it is not consistent with the great prevalence of the genitive in Cicero's *Orations*, a discrepancy which the author would explain by the "warm, personal" style of the speeches. But any attempt to discover essential traces of the *sermo familiaris* in the *Orations* can hardly count on extensive approval. It seems doubtful whether after all the difference in case usage is not essentially one of chronology alone. It is questionable, too, whether the author's preference for the dative as against the genitive in four much-debated passages in Plautus is sound, though he has aimed conscientiously to present and weigh the evidence on both sides of this question.

This treatment, of the subject, it should be added, is not complete for the entire language, or even for the bulk of the classical Latinity, being based upon an examination of some ten representative prose writers and eight representative poets of different periods. Hence the final discussion of the topic must yet be awaited.

CHARLES E. BENNETT